

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Antonio Burts, #194576,

Plaintiff,

vs.

C/A No. 8:07-3011-HMH

ORDER

Greenville Clerk of Court; Solicitor's Office 13th Judicial)
Circuit; Attorney Dorothy A. Manigault; Philpot Law Firm)
P.A.; Solicitor Robert M. Ariail; Appellate Defense Chief)
Attorney Joseph L. Savitz; Deputy Chief Wanda H. Carter;)
Attorney General Henry McMaster; Asst. Att. Gen. Karen)
Ratjan; PCR Attorney Kenneth C. Gibson; Everett P. Godfrey)
Esquire 06-OF-775, (Frank L. Epps, Esquire 06-DE-L-777, In)
Connection With Case # 6:06-2500-HMH-BHH and Case)
PCR # 2006-CP-23-0611) David Wagner and David Ross,)
Esquire #Case 06-DE-L-873, Susannah Ross Esquire 06-DE-)
L-0778 Edward E. Welmaker Judge) Judge PCR Gary)
Michael Nettles. Trial Judge Nov 28-2005 Judge Edward W.)
Miller.) Supreme Court of South Carolina; Daniel E.)
Shearhouse; Brenda F. Shealy; Senator Ralph Anderson;)
Senator Kay ; S.C. Department of Public Safety; Greenville)
County Investigations Division; O.B. Smith Sergeant,)
Selective Enforcement Division 804-371-3629; and All)
Investigators Involved; U.S. Department of Justice)
Washington D.C. TW: b1 DJ 144-67-0; United States Postal)
Service; South Carolina State Conference; Govenor Marshall)
C. Sanford Jr;. United State Senator Lindsey S. Graham;)
Glenn F. McConnel; South Carolina Legislators; Appellate)
Defense S.C. Office; Circuit Court Reporter Hollie M.)
Jenkins; and PCR Court Reporter, on Feb-27-2007);)
Greenville County Magistrate Court Judges In Connection)
With All Criminal Background Records of Above) Bond)
Proceedings Etc. Within Herein, Indigent Defense S.C.); Kaye)
Hearn, Court of Appeals, Supreme Court Judicial Department)
Jean Hoefer Toal, James E. Moore). S.C. Social Security)
Office Washington D.C.)

Defendants.

Plaintiff is a prisoner at Lee Correctional Institution who, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint concerning prison conditions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By Order dated November 13, 2007, Plaintiff was given a second opportunity to provide the necessary information and paperwork to bring the case into proper form for evaluation and possible service of process. Plaintiff was warned that failure to provide the necessary information within the timetable set in the Order would subject the case to dismissal. Plaintiff did not respond to the Order and the time for response has lapsed. Plaintiff has failed to prosecute this case and has failed to comply with an order of this Court. The case is dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Link v. Wabash Railroad Company*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
United States District Judge

December 19, 2007
Greenville, South Carolina